Appl. No. 10/707,773 Amdt. dated September 25, 2006 Reply to Office action of July 25, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arslain et al (US 6,366,153) in view of Official Notice.

5

10

Response:

Independent claims 1 and 6 have each been amended to overcome these claim rejections. Each of the claims 1 and 6 now contain limitations specifying the structure of the PWM device. The PWM device contains a pulse width modulator and first and second switches that are controlled by the pulse width modulator. These amendments are fully supported in Figure 1 as well as paragraphs [0014] and [0019] of the specification. No new matter is added. Because the PWM device contains first and second switches controlled by the pulse width modulator, the present invention is able to provide unlimited control of the power supplied by the PWM device. Having two switches allows the PWM device to immediately adjust itself when the output voltage is either too high or too low for providing stable electric power. Because of this, the PWM device is suitable for use in a computer for supplying power to a central processing unit.

20

15

On the other hand, Arslain teaches in Figure 1 using only a single switch 116, which means that Arslain cannot provide unlimited control of the supplied power. Therefore, Arslain does not teach all of the claimed limitations of the currently amended claims 1 and 6, and Arslain's structure does not contain all of the advantages that the structure of the claimed invention brings.

25

For these reasons, independent claims 1 and 6 should each be allowable over the cited prior art. Claims 2-4 and 7-9 are dependent on claims 1 and 6, and should Appl. No. 10/707,773 Amdt. dated September 25, 2006 Reply to Office action of July 25, 2006

be allowed if claims 1 and 6 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-4 and 6-9 is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arslain et al (US 6,366,153) in view of Official Notice, and further in view of admitted prior art.

Response:

5

Claims 5 and 10 are dependent on claims 1 and 6, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 6 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 5 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/707,773 Amdt. dated September 25, 2006 Reply to Office action of July 25, 2006

Sincerely yours,

Wentonton

Date: <u>09/25/2006</u>

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)